

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0583-01
Bill No.: HB 76
Subject: Courts; Juvenile Courts; Crimes and Punishment
Type: Original
Date: January 19, 2001

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
General Revenue Fund	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)	Less than (\$100,000)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
None			
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator** assume the proposed legislation would have no fiscal impact on their agency.

Officials from the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** stated that they could not predict the number of new commitments which could result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in the proposal. An increase in commitments would depend on the utilization of prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the courts. If additional persons were sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC would incur a corresponding increase in operational costs either through incarceration (FY99 average \$35.61 per inmate, per day) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY 99 average \$2.47 per offender, per day). Supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but DOC officials assume that the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

The following factor contributes to DOC's minimal assumption:

- DOC assumes the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders.

If long-range fiscal impact would prove to be an amount in excess of that which could be absorbed by DOC, any costs profiled in this fiscal note would be requested through normal budgetary request procedures for the time periods affected by passage of this legislation.

The need for additional capital improvements or rental space is not anticipated at this time. It must be noted that the cumulative effect of various new legislation, if adopted, could result in the need for additional capital improvements funding if the total number of new offenders exceeds current planned capacity.

Oversight assumes that the conviction and incarceration of only one person would create a minimal fiscal impact of less than \$100,000 annually.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
---	---------------------	---------	---------

GENERAL REVENUE FUND

<u>Costs - Department of Corrections</u> Incarceration/Probation Costs	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>
---	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------

ESTIMATED EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>	Less than <u>(\$100,000)</u>
---	---	---	---

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
---	---------------------	---------	---------

	\$0	\$0	\$0
--	-----	-----	-----

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

DESCRIPTION

This proposal adds juvenile court officers to the list of judicial officers in the crime of tampering with a judicial officer.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of State Courts Administrator
Department of Corrections



Jeanne Jarrett, CPA
Director

January 19, 2001